# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/602,362 | 06/23/2003 | Toshihiko Ohtuka | 03379/LH | 1151 |

1933          7590          07/21/2008
FRISHAUF, HOLTZ, GOODMAN & CHICK, PC
220 Fifth Avenue
16TH Floor
NEW YORK, NY 10001-7708

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| DICKERSON, CHAD S |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2625 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 07/21/2008 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1.     Applicant's arguments filed 6/7/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the After-final Amendment filed on 6/7/2008, the Applicant traverses the rejection of the claims.  The Applicant asserts that the rejection of the claims using the references of Anderson (USP 7197531), Shiota (US 2002/0032909), Okamoto (US 2002/0198954) and Iwata (USP 6778289) do not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations.  The first argument was regarding the Anderson reference.  The Applicant contends that the reference of Anderson does not specifically disclose the e-mail receiver of the terminal device, the address generating unit of the printing machine, or the transmitter of the terminal device recited in claim 11.  The Examiner respectfully disagrees with this assertion.

When viewing the claim language applied to Anderson, the Examiner cited portions of the reference to read on the claim limitation of "*an e-mail receiver which receives the e-mail including the temporary address information of said server, from said printing machines*".  In the system of Anderson, the client device is able to receive electronic messages or computer files through the network from the gateway server. The meaning of email is simply interpreted as electronic messages or computer files sent over a network.  Anderson performs this feature when sending a warning to a user through the browser regarding deletion of image data or through sending a URL translated from an image ID to a browser of a user's client device.  The URL information

is translated from the image ID and this information is sent to the client (12) through the gateway server (20) (see col. 8, ln 15-62 and col. 9, ln 24-35). Also, as stated in final rejection, the printing functionality can be realized through the use of the photo-service sites. With this functionality present in the system in the image gateway through the site adaptors, the two components realized together function as the printing machines in Applicant's system (see col. 4, ln 35-39). With the above explanation, the Examiner believes the function of the email receiver listed in the claim language of the terminal device is performed.

Regarding the address generating unit of the printing machine, the Examiner also feels that this feature is met. The claim language states "*an address generating unit which generates a temporary address of said server*". The address developed in the system of Anderson is an address translated from the image ID. The reasoning behind saying this URL can also be temporary is because if no image ID is present in the system uniquely identifying an image, how can a URL be developed to access the image data? The Examiner believes that if the image data remains on the system temporarily, then the URL that is translated from the image ID is also temporary. It is clear that the image gateway performs the feature of developing such an address through the server (20) (see col. 7, ln 54 – col. 8, ln 63). Therefore, with the reasoning above, the Examiner also still feels that the generation of a temporary address of the location of the image data on the server is performed.

Regarding the last feature asserted as not disclosed, the claim limitation states "*a transmitter which accesses the temporary address of said server included in the e-mail*

*received by said e-mail receiver, and which transmits image data generated by said*

*image capturing unit to said server"*. The Examiner believes this feature is met simply

by the broad nature of the claim language. The Examiner realizes the explanation of

the invention in the arguments, but when viewing the claim language, this is not

necessarily performing what the Applicant is arguing. First, when looking at the first

limitation, *a transmitter which accesses the temporary address of said server included in*

*the e-mail received by said e-mail receiver"*, the Examiner clearly pointed the

interpretation of the temporary address above and email. When looking at Anderson,

the client device is used to access the URL shown on its browser, which can reflect

stored information on the server, and view the image data (see col. 8, ln 15-63). This is

an example of a client device receiving an electronic message or computer files over a

network and receiving this information through the URL.

Next, the last part of the feature states *"a transmitter which transmits image data*

*generated by said image capturing unit to said server"*. In the system, the client device

of Anderson performs the transmission of generated image data the image gateway

through the gateway server. The client device is able to upload images on the server

(see col. 7, ln 4-53). The Applicant argues that the manner in which the transferring of

image data to the server device is not performed by Anderson, but the Examiner argues

that the broad nature of the claim language clearly reads on the Anderson reference.

Therefore, the Examiner believes that the Anderson reference performs the claim

limitations that were proposed in the last Amendment.

The Applicant argues that the references of Okamoto and Iwata do not disclose the feature of the temporary address, but the Examiner would like to mention that the Anderson reference does in fact does teach the temporary address listed in the claim limitations. Therefore, the temporary address limitation is taught by Anderson in connection with the rejection involving the other three references.

Regarding the arguments toward the reference of Shiota, the Examiner would like to note that the reference of Shiota was used in the final rejection to have the printing unit acquire an email address (see paragraphs [0040]-[0049]). Shiota also performs the feature of forwarding image data to a printer to be printed (see fig. 3; paragraph [0045], [0046]). Also, Anderson performs the feature of the claim language, which involves having an address of image data associated with a server and having image data transmitted to the server from the client device. The argument of *"assigning a server as transmission destination and transmitting image data by a digital camera or a PDA"* is the same as the limitation in the terminal that states, *"a transmitter which accesses the temporary address of said server included in the e-mail received by said e-mail receiver, and which transmits image data generated by said image capturing unit to said server"*. The limitation simply states a transmitter that access the temporary address on the server that was sent to the client device and that the transmitter transmits image data generated by the client device to the server. This does not state the argued feature of the terminal or client device <u>accessing the temporary address on the server and sending generated image data to the accessed temporary address, which was sent in email at the moment of accessing the URL</u>. This last statement

(paraphrase of argument on page 9) is clearly different from the claim limitation. Most of the arguments regarding the claim limitations and their application to Shiota are more specific than the actual claim language itself. The references of Anderson and Shiota were only applied to certain limitations, but the Okamoto and Iwata references were used to cover the deficiencies of the first two references.

The Okamoto reference was used to cover the limitation of receiving image data from the server in response to access and this is seen in paragraphs [0121]-[0126] of the reference. Also, the reference of Iwata was used to have a printing machine access an address on a server and for the server to forward information to the printer for printing in response to the access. This limitation is found in column 5, line 38-65.

With the combination of all the references, the claim limitations as filed are met and the rejection is maintained.

### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHAD DICKERSON whose telephone number is (571)270-1351. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Thur. 9:00-6:30 Fri. 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Twyler Haskins can be reached on (571)-272-7406. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/C. D./
/Chad Dickerson/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/Twyler L. Haskins/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625